UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/977,900	10/10/2001	Bruce W. Stevens	80072	6876

23523 7590 09/30/2004

NAVAL UNDERSEA WARFARE CENTER
DIVISION NEWPORT
1176 HOWELL STREET, CODE 000C
BLDG 112T
NEWPORT, RI 02841

EXAMINER	
ROSWELL, MICHAEL	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/977,900	STEVENS, BRUCE W.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Roswell	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 February 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 February 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 11, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The use of the term "unlike presentation display" found in the claims has multiple possible meanings, and is not clarified by supportive language in the claims or specification. The claims are thus subjected to the broadest reasonable interpretation by the Examiner.

As a result, claims depending on the above rejected claims stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookspan et al (US Patent 6,636,888), hereinafter Bookspan, and "Network Time Protocol (NTP) General Overview" by David L. Mills, hereinafter Mills.

Regarding claim 1, Bookspan teaches the use of Microsoft Outlook to schedule and synchronize presentation broadcasts across a network. Outlook must be installed on every computer on the network in order for a user to receive messages about the presentation (see col. 5, lines 33-41), and controls the presentations by delivering presentation content to audience computers (at col. 22, lines 1-21) and allowing the creator of a broadcast to select the display method for the presentation, which allows for the control of unlike presentations (at col. 11, lines 11-31, since Bookspan teaches the use of Microsoft Powerpoint presentations for display to a user, and Powerpoint is well known in the art to allow random transitions between slides in a slide show, therefore making presentation displays different, and the different presentation display options of col. 11, lines 32-39). Furthermore, Bookspan shows installing a set of files to be presented on each of a plurality of computers, including an initial file to be played and an ending file to be played (taught at col. 11, lines 11-31 as the stored HTML pages for a

presentation broadcast, which inherently include the first and last slides in a Powerpoint presentation). Bookspan also teaches associating playing timing with each set of displayed files such that an effective beginning time and play duration is associated with each file, as well as the start time for each initial file for each instance of the presentation (taught as the ability to select a start time and an end time associated with each presentation, at Fig. 7, and col. 13, lines 20-28). Inherently, each slide in a Powerpoint presentation is displayed sequentially.

Bookspan, however, fails to explicitly teach synchronizing each computer displaying the selected presentation to a common time.

Mills describes the use of a Network Time Protocol (NTP) for synchronizing the clocks of host computers and routers in the Internet in use since 1992 (see Mills, pages 2 and 9), or over a network such as that used by Bookspan.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bookspan and Mills before him at the time the invention was made to modify the synchronized broadcast system of Bookspan to include the common time synchronization of Mills in order to obtain a system for the synchronized broadcast of presentations wherein all computers in the network have a common time.

One would be motivated to make such a combination for the advantages of synchronization for real-time teleconferencing and presentation broadcasting, transaction journaling and logging, network monitoring, and secure timestamping, among other uses. See Mills, page 4.

Regarding claims 2-4, Microsoft Powerpoint is well known in the art to allow the inclusion of multiple selectable graphic and audio files of various formats in a presentation, which may be different from other graphic or audio files contained therein.

Regarding claim 5, Bookspan teaches running a second plurality of simultaneous and independent executions of the software control program for controlling a second plurality of unlike presentation displays (taught as the displaying of HTML presentations in browser windows in Fig. 3, which are well known in the art to allow for a plurality of open windows displaying different files), and coordinating a display sequence for each unlike presentation display (taught inherently by the slide sequence of a Powerpoint presentation).

Regarding claim 6, Bookspan shows in Fig. 7 the setting of beginning and ending times for a presentation, which therefore sets the effective beginning time and play duration.

Regarding claim 7, Bookman teaches determining an effective beginning time (at Fig. 7, as shown *supra*) and determines a play duration based on a collective time of previous image files and a given play duration time (taught as the use of Windows Media Player to display the presentation, at col. 24, lines 20-28 and col. 16, lines 3-10, which is well known to display in a playlist audio or video files to be played, the duration of each file, and the total duration of all files listed).

Regarding claim 8, Bookspan teaches the use of a scenario file, taught as the use of .asf files for providing information pertaining to the timing and sequence of audio/video data in a presentation, at col. 22, lines 8-19, which inherently uses a read scenario file command to read the scenario file. Furthermore, Bookspan must inherently teach a get image command in order to retrieve each image listed in the scenario file.

Bookspan also teaches software timing control for coordinating the display timing of image files for each of a plurality of computers, taught as the ability of the presenter to synchronize the advance of the presentation or the execution of effects between all presentation displays, at cols. 23-24, lines 61-9.

Regarding claims 9-10, software written in independent programming languages so as to be operable on various operating systems are notoriously well known in the art, as are platform independent programming languages such as java, perl, python, and javascript. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of these teachings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to write the synchronized presentation broadcast system of Bookspan and Mills in a platform independent programming language.

Regarding claim 13, Mills describes the use of a Network Time Protocol (NTP) for synchronizing the clocks of host computers and routers in the Internet in use since 1992 (see Mills, pages 2 and 9), or over a network such as that used by Bookspan.

Regarding claim 14, Bookspan teaches the use of Microsoft Outlook to schedule and synchronize presentation broadcasts across a network. Outlook must be installed on every computer on the network in order for a user to receive messages about the presentation (see col. 5, lines 33-41), and controls the presentations by delivering presentation content to audience computers (at col. 22, lines 1-21) and allowing the creator of a broadcast to select the display method for the presentation, which allows for the control of unlike presentations (at col. 11, lines 11-31, since Bookspan teaches the use of Microsoft Powerpoint presentations for display to a user, and Powerpoint is well

known in the art to allow random transitions between slides in a slide show, therefore making presentation displays different, and the different presentation display options of col. 11, lines 32-39). The presentations are run simultaneously and synchronized with one another, and are automatically started by the presenter (see col. 22, lines 1-21).

Regarding claim 15, the use of random transitions in a Powerpoint presentation as described above guarantees a different sequence of displays among a plurality of computers.

Regarding claim 16, Bookspan shows installing a set of files to be presented on each of a plurality of computers, including an initial file to be played and an ending file to be played (taught at col. 11, lines 11-31 as the stored HTML pages for a presentation broadcast, which inherently include the first and last slides in a Powerpoint presentation).

Regarding claims 17 and 18, Bookspan teaches associating playing timing with each set of displayed files such that an effective beginning time and play duration is associated with each file, as well as the start time for each initial file for each instance of the presentation (taught as the ability to select a start time and an end time associated with each presentation, at Fig. 7, and col. 13, lines 20-28).

Regarding claim 19, Bookspan teaches running a second plurality of simultaneous and independent executions of the software control program for controlling a second plurality of unlike presentation displays (taught as the displaying of HTML presentations in browser windows in Fig. 3, which are well known in the art to allow for a

plurality of open windows displaying different files), and coordinating a display sequence for each unlike presentation display (taught inherently by the slide sequence of a Powerpoint presentation).

Regarding claim 20, software written in independent programming languages so as to be operable on various operating systems are notoriously well known in the art, as are platform independent programming languages such as java, perl, python, and javascript. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of these teachings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to write the synchronized presentation broadcast system of Bookspan and Mills in a platform independent programming language.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookspan, Mills, and Hogle, IV (US Patent 5,923,307), hereinafter Hogle.

Regarding claim 11, Bookspan and Mills have been shown *supra* to teach a synchronized presentation display system that allows for unlike presentation displays.

However, Bookspan and Mills do not teach displaying such presentations in a multiple monitor system, or selecting a desired monitor to display a presentation.

Hogle teaches configuring monitor screen displays in a multiple monitor environment, and furthermore illustrates in Fig. 4 and at col. 1, lines 53-67 the display of application windows specific to a desired monitor, which may be moved to another monitor, if desired.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bookspan, Mills, and Hogle before him at the time the invention was

made to modify the synchronized presentation display system of Bookspan and Mills to include the multiple monitor display of Hogle, in order to obtain a presentation display system shown in a multiple monitor environment.

One would be motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of reducing screen clutter or allowing the display of multiple large regions simultaneously. See Hogle, col. 1, lines 42-52.

Regarding claim 12, Hogle teaches the combining of multiple monitors with separate raster display areas into a composite raster area, at col. 9, lines 43-54. Hogle further teaches a display command for designating a particular monitor for presentation display by setting an x, y coordinate position within the raster area, at col. 9, lines 6-9 and cols. 16-17, lines 61-8.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art pertains to synchronized presentation displays and the state of the art in general.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Roswell whose telephone number is (703) 305-5914, and at (571) 272-4055 on or after October 18, 2004. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116, and at (571) 272-4048 on or after October 18, 2004. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Roswell

9/23/2004

CAO (KEVIN) NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER